## SEALED SOURCE PROCESS KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION FORM

PKE Number Page 1 of 4

Ocation by To be accomplated by new content									
Section I: To be completed by generator									
General Information: (If more than two, attach spreadsheet)									
1.									
	encapsulated in resin, 1/4"):								
2.	Present location of source: (Bldg/Room)								
3.									
Radiological Characterization: There must be information available to support the below information. All determinations must be reproducible.									
4.	Radionuclides present in the waste and the activity for each nuclide:								
	Radionuclide	Activity of Source(Ci		Activity when shielded	<u>Weight</u>				
			_	<u>(if shielded)</u>	<del></del>				
			_						
			_						
			_						
$\Box$ S	ee attached sheet								
<b>5</b> .	Determination of r	Determination of radionuclides:							
	☐ Process Knowle	edge: Explain: (Example	: Inv	entory Controls)					
	☐ Radioanalysis (	attach results)		Radiological swipe (attach resu	ults)				
	Gamma Spectro	oscopy		Alpha Spectroscopy					
6. Determination of Activity: <b>Documentation must be attached describing all calculations at assumptions used to obtain the activity values.</b>									
	<ul> <li>☐ Gamma Spectroscopy</li> <li>☐ Mass Balance</li> <li>☐ High Sensitivity Neutron Instrument</li> <li>☐ Material Managements Spreadsheet</li> </ul>			Alpha Spectroscopy					
				Mass to Curie Conversion					
				☐ Tritium Off Gas Measurement					
				Other (explain)					
		•		-					
	List procedure(s) f	ollowed:							
7.		Source verification documentation for each source: (Must have 2 of the following)							
	☐ Materials Management sealed source inventory printout								
	☐ Copy of the NIST Certification for the source								
	Photographs of the sealed source(s)								
•		□ A memo describing how the identity of the source was determined and verified.  Are the sources shielded? □ Yes □ No, □ some are (list which sources are shielded)							
8.	Are the sources sh	ielded? □ Yes □ No,	ome are (list which sources are	shielded)					
	a. Is the source lead shielded? ☐ Yes ☐ No								
	b. What is the shielding material?								
9.		O	s, exp	olain additional packaging requ	irements.				
		. J		1 0 0 1					

## SEALED SOURCE PROCESS KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION FORM

PKE Number Page 2 of 4

Wests Englishing	=						
Waste Evaluation:							
10. Does the waste contain any of the following:							
Verified by: VI=Visual Inspection; S&A=Sampling and Analysis; PK=Process Knowledge, When PK is							
checked, it must be supported by Visual Inspection (VI) or an explanation must be documented.							
(Example: Inventory controls, none used in process, or reference supporting documentation, if not							
already described above, (e.g., logbooks, drawings). a. Grease/oil □ Yes □ No □ VI □ S&A □ PK							
<u>-</u>	-						
If yes, what are the residues c. Entrapped Liquids	-						
If yes, is it less than 0.5% by volume of the waste?   Yes I No	-						
What is the liquid?							
d. Particulates [> 1% by weight of < 10-micrometer diameter (flour) or > 15% by weight	_						
of < 200-micrometer diameter (sand)]							
e. Compressed gases							
f. Etiological agents	_						
g. Chelating agents 🗆 Yes 🗆 No 🗇 S&A 🗇 PK							
If yes, is the concentration less than 1% by weight?   Yes  No							
h. PCBs (capacitors, etc.) ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ VI ☐ S&A ☐ PK	_						
i. Explosives	_						
j. Pyrophorics	_						
k. Asbestos	_						
If yes, is it $\Box$ friable $\Box$ non-friable. If friable, please segregate.							
When Sampling and Analysis is used, attach results.							
Supporting Information							
11. Operational use of the source(s):							
12. Historical locations of source(s):	_						
13. Year source(s) were purchased:	_						
•	-						
14. Was the source designed and fabricated on-site? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, describe any documents (e.g. specifications, engineering notes) available for material traceability	- <b>.</b> .						
If yes, describe any documents (e.g. specifications, engineering notes) available for material traceability	.y.						
	-						
15 Manufacture's Specifications /Information Assailable?	-						
15. Manufacture's Specifications ∕ Information Available? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, list specification information and location							
If yes, list specification information and location	-						
40 III B	-						
16. List Procurement Documentation (e.g. purchase requisition, statement of work), if applicable:	-						
	-						
Generator (please print) extension	-						
Signature Date							
	=						
Section II. HWM REVIEW AND VALIDATION							
1. The waste matches the description above. $\square$ Yes $\square$ No							
The serial number matches the serial number on the sources. $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ NA							
Section I is complete.   Yes  No							
3. Section I is complete. ☐ Yes ☐ No							
Completed by: Print Signature Date	_						

## SEALED SOURCE PROCESS KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION FORM

PKE Number Page 3 of 4

Section III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST REVIEW							
supp	When the generator is using process knowledge to characterize his waste the EA should review the supporting documentation. If no documentation is reviewed, explain why, (e.g., visually examined the waste, documented any interviews with the generator).						
1.	Based on the information provided on this PKE Form, the waste is free of regulated hazardous materials. $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No						
2.	List the documentation that was reviewed to support the characterization of this waste stream.						
	☐ See attached list of additional support documentation that was reviewed.						
	☐ Waste characterization memo attached.						
	□ No documentation was reviewed: Explain why:						
ΕA	Print Signature Date						
Sec	tion IV. HEALTH PHYSICIST REVIEW						
1.	Based on the information provided on this PKE Form, the waste has been properly characterized as to its radiological content. $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No						
	☐ See attached memo for additional information.						
2.	The anticipated range of error associated with the method described in Section I, 8 is						
3.	Method is reproducible. ☐ Yes ☐ No Method is representative. ☐ Yes ☐ No						
HP I	Print Signature Date						
	<u>-</u>						
i	tion V. WASTE CERTIFICATION ENGINEER REVIEW iological Characterization:						
1.	The radionuclides described above are identified on the Waste Stream Characterization Data Sheet and are within the ranges listed.   Yes NA (Waste is not destined for NTS)						
2.	The radionuclides described above are performance assessment critical isotopes. $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ NA $\square$ NVO PA $\square$ Hanford PA $\square$ Envirocare						
3.	Are there decay chain isotopes that require reporting?    Yes    No  If yes, list the Reportable Isotopes						
4.	Does the waste contain fissile material?						
	If yes, are there criticality safety requirements? ☐ Yes ☐ No						
	If yes, please attach safety requirements.						
5.	Are the quantity and type of radionuclides present sufficient to generate nuclear heating?   Yes   No If yes, list expected wattage.						
	F Print Signature Date						
/// 'l	Lumint Signotium Data						

## SEALED SOURCE PROCESS KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION FORM

PKE Number Page 4 of 4

WAS	WASTE CERTIFICATION ENGINEER REVIEW continued								
General Review:									
1.	Sections I, II, III, and IV have been completed by qualified personnel.								
2.	☐ The above sections are properly completed.								
3.	☐ The above sections illustrate that the waste is acceptable.								
	$\square$ The above sections indicate that the waste may not be acceptable for shipment to the NTS.								
	☐ The waste was segregated and identified for further evaluation.								
	Upon further evaluation, the waste was found to be:								
	<ul><li>acceptable, and can be packaged for shipment to NTS.</li><li>unacceptable, and shall remain segregated.</li></ul>								
4.	NCAR Issued,   NCAR Issued,   NCAR Number								
5.	Surveillance conducted:  Surveillance Number:								
6	Critical equipment being utilized to process waste is as follows: (e.g. scales, torque wrenches)								
□ Se	See attached list Critical equipment has been entered into the database Initials								
WCE	E Print Signature Date								
Sect	ction VI. WASTE CERTIFICATION OFFICIAL REVIEW								
1.	I have reviewed the information on this form and certify that the subject waste is not mixed waste and meets the requirements of NVO-325 (current version). $\square$ NA (Waste is not destined for NTS)								
2.	The waste is acceptable to be packaged for shipment to $\square$ NTS $\square$ Hanford $\square$ Envirocare.								
WCC	CO Print Signature Date								
i	ction VII. COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS								
Pack	kaging:								
	Waste will be packaged in accordance with:								
	Packaging Instructions Number:								
	Facility Specific Handling and Packaging Procedure.								
l	Procedure:								
Traii	ining:								
	Required Training. EP0006 and D EP0110 or D OJT								
	Training records are on file for the generator.   Yes No,								
	If no, the generator was given OJT.								
Wast	Waste Characterization Summary:								
	The appropriate Waste Characterization Summary Form has been updated in accordance with WCP-15.								
	☐ Yes Initials								
WC	E Print Signature Date								
	E Print Signature Date								